

SECRET

50X1-HUM

Years later, in December 1948, at a meeting of Moscow therapists held at MONOKI, Ye. M. Tareyev presented a report which appeared to be a continuation as well as conclusion to Chernogubov's teachings. Rather than go into Tareyev's report too deeply, I should like to mention briefly that it is important to know the history of any field of medicine well, before attempting a report. It is therefore necessary to read up on Baye, Botkin and others who wrote on rheumatism and chronic sepsis as well as to acquaint oneself with the erroneous conceptions of such worthy scientists as Ashof, Schottmüller, Chernorutsky, Klinge, Abrikosov, Davidovskiy and others.

According to Tareyev, the participants at the 1948 meeting came to the conclusion that "there is no relationship between rheumatic and subacute septic endocarditis, and that the latter is a new process caused primarily by the action of streptococcus viridans." This appears to be in direct agreement with Chernogubov's ideas as he claimed that septic endocarditis is a complication of some general infection caused by the microbes known to be of the same etiology as sepsis lenta. It is logical to consider, therefore, that although rheumatism can be arrested in its initial stage, an attack of septic endocarditis following this rheumatic condition will effect the valves of the heart which have already been weakened by rheumatism.

However it must be borne in mind that infection of the valves is not always the result of the action of microbes. The action of microbes is effective only in the presence of toxins. This fact has been proved by experiments with toxic substances, for example, allylformate.

Later on Lang and Kechker, after prolonged laboratory studies, reported that "in spite of the data obtained, we are in no position to disprove the contention that rheumatic endocarditis and the onset of septic endocarditis are variations of the reactions of one and the same macroorganism."

Therefore, it is easy to see Kechker's position when he claims that "there is only one form of endocarditis, which without any relationship to the character of the pathologic-anatomic changes in the valvular-endocardium without any relationship to the presence or absence of a source of infection in the blood or on the valvular endocardium, and without any relationship to the etiologic characteristics of this disease, nevertheless has various clinical pictures of the course of this disease. This difference between the clinical and the pathologic-anatomic picture can be based on the nonstandard relation in each individual case between the micro- and macroorganisms." It is much harder to understand Chernogubov's contentions that "rheumatic and septic endocarditis are variations of the reactions of one and the same macroorganism."

Tareyev's article concludes by stating that on the strength of the high level of reports submitted by Soviet therapists, it is possible to state that Soviet science is foremost in dealing with problems of subacute septic endocarditis.

But how about the other scientists, who are carrying on the fight against Chernogubov's influence which seems to follow the theory of foreign scientists? Tareyev apparently presented only one side of the picture, and for this reason his contention that this disease should be called "Chernogubov's disease" cannot be accepted.

- E N D -

SECRET